

OCT 01 2007

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BAMBANG HIDAJAT,

Petitioner,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,** Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-73793

Agency No. A95-294-366

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 24, 2007***

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Bambang Hidajat, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals upholding an Immigration Judge's

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“IJ”) denial of his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for substantial evidence, *Ali v. Ashcroft*, 394 F.3d 780, 784 (9th Cir. 2005), we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s finding that the harms Hidajat experienced did not amount to past persecution. *See Prasad v. INS*, 47 F.3d 336, 339-40 (9th Cir. 1995). Additionally, substantial evidence supports the IJ’s finding that Hidajat does not have a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Lolong v. Gonzales*, 484 F.3d 1173, 1181 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc); *cf. Sael v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2004).

Because Hidajat cannot meet the lower standard of eligibility for asylum, he has failed to show that he is entitled to withholding of removal. *See Prasad*, 47 F.3d at 340.

We decline to address Hidajat’s CAT claim as he failed to argue it in his opening brief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.